

REMARKS:

Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application. By this amendment claims 1 and 6-8 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the outstanding final Office Action and allowance of this application for at least the following reasons.

Interview Summary

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner and the Supervisory Patent Examiner for the courtesy of the personal interview conducted on August 1, 2005. The remarks made herein are consistent with the issues discussed during the interview.

Withdrawal of Finality

As set forth in the Interview Summary, the Examiner agreed to withdrawal the finality of the Office Action mailed June 29, 2005 upon submission of the claim amendments provided above. As such, Applicants request entry of this amendment After Final.

Lack of Enablement Rejections:

In the Office Action, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. In particular, regarding claims 1 and 8, the language "delivering...the controlled parameter undesired command signal to at least one output" was deemed to be not supported in the specification.

Applicants submit that the rejected claim language is enabling to one skilled in the art and is fully supported in the specification. However, in light of the agreements made during the Personal Interview, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to address the examiner's concerns. In particular, Applicants have amended the phrase "delivering the controlled parameter undesired command signal" in claims 1 and 8. Applicants submit that claims 1-15 remain fully supported by the originally filed specification and would fully enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention of claims 1-15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejections be withdrawn.

Indefiniteness Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-15 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. In particular, regarding claims 1 and 8, the language "the controlled parameter undesired command signal to at least one output" was deemed ambiguous and unclear.

Applicants respectfully disagree that rejected claims 1-15 are indefinite, however, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to address the examiner's concerns. In particular, Applicants have amended the phrase "the controlled parameter undesired command signal to at least one output" in claims 1 and 8. Applicants submit that claims 1-15 are clear and definite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

After review of the claims 1 and 8, Applicants have further clarified the language thereof by removing the phrase “activating a desired command as a function of the desired command signal.” Applicants submit that this amendment merely deletes a redundancy within claims 1 and 8 and, as such, does not affect the scope of the claims.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully point out that in the Personal Interview, conducted on April 28, 2005, the Examiner indicated that the then pending claimed invention overcame the prior art. Applicants submit that the amendments made herein merely rephrase the language of the then pending claims and, as such, do not affect the scope of the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and re-examination of this application and timely allowance of the pending claims.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conversation might advance prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned representative at 202-408-4397.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account no. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 16, 2005

By: 

Timothy P. McNulty
Reg. No. 56,939